



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/050,346

01/15/2002

Jun Gao

10012641-1

5995

7590

09/09/2004

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

GUADALUPE, YARITZA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2859

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/050,346	Applicant(s) GAO ET AL.	
	Examiner Yaritza Guadalupe McCall	Art Unit 2859	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 10-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 21-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

In response to Amendment filed on June 17, 2004.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1 – 9 and 21 - 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated by Allen et al. (US 6,291,829).

Allen et al. discloses a method and apparatus for surface texture analysis comprising the steps of analyzing an information or image signal by extracting texture related features and producing an output signal representative of said features which will be algorithmically processed to discriminate and classify media by having at least two input parameters, i.e., extracted features such as average gray scale values, spatial frequencies, etc., and having an output which has a joint dependency on said input parameter, i.e., identify the type or class of media, said input parameters being associated with image – related measurements acquired from imaging textural features which are characteristics of different classes of media said output being an identification of a media class, wherein said media class includes at least one type of paper with surface textural features that are inherent to said media class.

Allen et al. further discloses imaging a medium of interest (See Column 6, lines 25 – 40) to acquire image information regarding surface textural features of said medium of interest, said textural features being related to structure of said medium of interest. Allen et al. discloses determining said image – related measurements, i.e., surface textural features, from said image information.

Allen et al. also discloses employing a probabilistic input – output system to associate said medium of interest with a selected media class, including using said image – related measurements, i.e., surface textural features such as gray scale values, determined from said image information as said input parameters (See Column 7, lines 17 - 67) and ultimately classify said media of interest into classes or type (See Column 8, lines 24 – 38).

The method steps as stated in claims 2 – 9 can be met by the regular operation of the apparatus disclosed by Allen et al. since it is clearly stated that one skilled in the art of algorithms for calculating measurements from sensor data will readily appreciate that a variety of computational methods that are already available, i.e., cluster weighted modeling, so as to ultimately classify said media of interest into classes or type and since Allen et al. already discloses the use of mathematical algorithms, look-up tables and multidimensional polynomials (See Column 7, lines 35 – 67) in order to ultimately classify a medium of interest based on said surface texture parameters.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see pages 7 – 9, filed February 2, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 – 9 and 21 - 24 under 102 (e) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Allen et al.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yaritza Guadalupe McCall whose telephone number is (571) 272-2244. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 AM - 6:30 PM.

Art Unit: 2859

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Diego F.F. Gutierrez can be reached on (571) 272-2245. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Yaritza Guadalupe
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2859
September 7, 2004

DIEGO F.F. GUTIERREZ
SUPERVISOR PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800